

Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Programs Leading to Bilingual Authorization



**A Handbook for Teacher Educators
and Program Reviewers**

This handbook, like other publications of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, is not copyright. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution is requested.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95811
(888) 921-2682 (toll free)

This handbook is available at:
<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/>

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

State of California
Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor

Members of the Commission

Caleb Chung, Chair	Teacher Representative
Margaret Gaston, Vice Chair	Public Representative
Constance Baumgardt Blackburn	Teacher Representative
Josephine Calderon	Public Representative
Marlon Evans	Public Representative
Charles Gahagan	Teacher Representative
Steven Dean	Teacher Representative
Leslie Littman	Designee, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Carolyn McInerney	School Board Member
Irene Oropeza-Enriquez	Administrative Services Representative
David Pearson	Faculty Representative
Ting Sun	Public Representative

Ex Officio Representatives

Shane Martin	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
Marilyn T. McGrath	California Postsecondary Education Commission
Tine Sloan	University of California
Beverly Young	California State University

Executive Officer

Dale A. Janssen	Executive Director
-----------------	--------------------

The Committee on Accreditation

2009

K-12 Professionals	
<p>Carol Leighty Superintendent Temecula Valley Unified School District</p> <p>Dana Griggs Educational Consultant San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools</p> <p>Joseph Jimenez BTSA Induction Cluster Region Director Tulare County Office of Education</p>	<p>Karen O'Connor Teacher Adobe Bluffs Elementary School Poway Unified School District</p> <p>Nancy Watkins Teacher Valencia High School Placentia-Yorba Linda School District</p> <p>Joyce Abrams Retired Teacher Chula Vista Hills Elementary School Chula Vista Elementary School District</p>
Postsecondary Professionals	
<p>Ellen Curtis-Pierce Associate Vice Chancellor for Professional Accreditation and Faculty Development Chapman University College</p> <p>Gary Kinsey Associate Dean, College of Education Cal Poly Pomona University</p> <p>Reyes Quezada Professor of Education University of San Diego</p>	<p>Lynne Cook Dean, College of Education California State University, Dominguez Hills</p> <p>Ruth Sandlin Chair, Educational Psychology Calif. State University, San Bernardino</p> <p>Sue Teele Director, Education Extension University of California, Riverside</p>

Commission Staff to the Committee on Accreditation:

Lawrence Birch, Director, Professional Services Division
 Teri Clark, Administrator of Accreditation, Professional Services Division
 Jo Birdsell, Consultant, Professional Services Division
 Cheryl Hickey, Consultant, Professional Services Division
 Rebecca Parker, Consultant, Professional Services Division
 Teri Ackerman, Analyst, Professional Services Division



The Bilingual Certification Design Team

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

2006-2007

Harold Acord	Spanish Teacher	Moreno Valley School District California Teachers Association
Estella Acosta Co-Chair	Administrator, Literacy and Language Development	Orange County Department of Education
Denise Beck	Principal	Davis Joint Unified School District
Karen Cadiero-Kaplan	Associate Professor	San Diego State University Past President (2007-08), California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL)
Sara Fields	Principal	Culver City Unified School District
Magaly Lavadenz	Professor	Loyola Marymount University Past President, California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE)
Claudia Lockwood	Director, Multilingual Education	San Joaquin County Office of Education
Teresa Márquez-López	Academic Administrator	University of California, Riverside
George Martínez	Teacher	Santa Cruz City Schools California Federation of Teachers
Huong Tran Nguyen	Professor	California State University, Long Beach
Lettie Ramírez	Professor	California State University, East Bay
Lilia Romero	National Board Certified Teacher with BCLAD Authorization	Pasadena Unified School District
Alexander Sapiens	Professor	San Jose State University
Gay Q. Yuen	Professor	California State University, Los Angeles
Charles G. Zartman, Jr. Chair	Professor	California State University, Chico
Commission Consultant to the Advisory Panel:		Jo Birdsell
California Department of Education Liaison to the Panel:		Paula Jacobs
Commission Assistants to the Advisory Panel:		Lori Gonzales
		Benjamin Pope



Bilingual Authorization Teacher Preparation Programs

Table of Contents

Introduction

Section 1: Standards of Quality and Effectiveness

Preconditions, Common Standards, and Program Standards	4
--	---

Section 2: Conceptual Framework

The Context for Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.....	5
Bilingual Methodologies	6
Crosscultural/Intercultural Knowledge and Pedagogy	7

Section 3: Submission Guidelines

Responding to the Preconditions, Common Standards and Bilingual Program Standards.....	8
Timeline for Implementation of the Bilingual Program Standards	12
Planning Timeline for Initial Program Approval.....	14
Review and Approval of Programs for Bilingual Authorization.....	15

Section 4: Transmittal Instructions..... 17

Transmittal Cover Sheet.....	18
------------------------------	----

Appendix A: Common Standards 20

Standard 1 Educational Leadership	20
Standard 2 Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation.....	20
Standard 3 Resources.....	20
Standard 4 Faculty and Instructional Personnel.....	20
Standard 5 Admission	21
Standard 6 Advice and Assistance.....	21
Standard 7 Field Experience and Clinical Practice	21
Standard 8 District-Employed Supervisors.....	21
Standard 9 Assessment of Candidate Competence.....	21
Common Standards Glossary	22

Appendix B: Program Standards

Standard 1 Program Design.....	27
Standard 2 Assessment of Candidate Competence.....	27
Standard 3 The Context for Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.....	28
Standard 4 Bilingual Methodology.....	30
Standard 5 Culture of Emphasis.....	32
Standard 6 Assessment of Candidate Language Competence	33

Appendix C: Resources for the Preparation of Bilingual Educators 34

Appendix D: Bilingual Program Information Survey 41



Appendix E: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Proficiency Standards Descriptions.....	42
Appendix F: Sample Matrix to Guide Bilingual Authorization Routes: CSET:LOTE Examination Subtests and Program Coursework.....	46



Introduction

The quality of public education depends substantially on the performance of professional educators. Like all other states, California requires educators to hold credentials granted by the state in order to serve in the public schools. Each state, including California, establishes and enforces standards and requirements for earning credentials for public school service. These certification standards and requirements are among the ways in which states exercise their constitutional responsibility for governing public education.

The quality of professional performance depends heavily on the quality of initial preparation. Each state has a legitimate interest in the quality of training programs for professional educators. In each state, completion of a professional preparation program that has been approved by the state's certification agency is a legal requirement for earning each type of credential, including teaching credentials. State legislatures adopt such requirements because they recognize the critical role of professional preparation in subsequent professional performance.

The bilingual teaching authorization prepares individuals to provide English language development, specially designed academic instruction in English and academic content instruction in both English and the language of their bilingual authorization. The Bilingual authorization may be earned concurrently with or added subsequent to a basic teaching document.

This handbook has been prepared to guide program sponsors in submitting documents for initial program approval as required by the *Accreditation Framework* and implemented by the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission).

This handbook is organized in four sections.

Section 1 provides information on the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Bilingual Authorization programs. The standards are available in Appendix A and Appendix B.

Section 2 provides the conceptual framework that addresses the body of research and information underlying the knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) adopted by the Commission for CSET: LOTE Examinations II or III, IV and V and the program standards for bilingual teacher authorization.

Section 3 provides submission guidelines for program sponsors preparing documentation for initial program approval and information on the review and approval of programs.

Section 4 provides instructions for the transmittal of program documents to the Commission.

The Commission is grateful to all the members of the profession who participated in the development of these program standards.

Section 1: Standards of Quality and Effectiveness

California state law authorizes the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to set standards and requirements for preparation of California teachers. The *Accreditation handbook* includes three types of standards:

- **Preconditions** established by State law or Commission policy must be met as a prerequisite to program accreditation. A precondition is a requirement for initial and continued program approval. Unlike standards, preconditions specify requirements for program compliance, not program quality. Commission staff members determine whether a program complies with the adopted preconditions on the basis of a program document provided by the college or university. In the program review sequence, a program that meets all preconditions is eligible for a more intensive review to determine whether the program's quality satisfies the Commission's standards.
- **Common Standards** of program quality and effectiveness apply to all credential programs. This category includes standards regarding the overall leadership and climate for educator preparation within the unit at an institution, as well as standards pertaining to quality features that are common to all programs such as resources, coordination, admissions and advisement. The Common Standards are available in Appendix A
- **Program Standards** address the quality of program features that are specific to a credential, such as program design, curriculum, field experiences, and knowledge and skills to be demonstrated by candidates in the specific credential area. When institutions prepare for continuing accreditation reviews, they may consider from among three Commission-approved options for program-specific standards. The three options are: (1) California Program Standards, (2) National or Professional Program Standards, and (3) Experimental Program Standards. Different options may be exercised by different credential programs at an institution.

Standards are statements of program quality that must be fulfilled for initial or continued approval of teacher preparation programs by the Commission. The Commission adopts program standards and in January 2008 the Commission adopted the Bilingual Authorization program standards. In each standard the Commission has detailed the minimum programmatic inputs and candidate competencies required for approval of a program.

The Commission determines whether a program satisfies a standard on the basis of an intensive review of all available information related to the standard. Program reviewers selected by the Executive Director must find that a program meets each Commission adopted standard. When the program has been deemed to meet all adopted standards, the program is recommended for approval to the COA, and the COA approves the program.

This handbook specifically addresses program standards for programs leading to bilingual authorization. The bilingual program standards have been designed to address current research and methodologies in bilingual education. These program standards are available in Appendix B.



Section 2: Conceptual Framework for Preparing California’s Bilingual Teachers

Program Standards for the preparation of bilingual teachers draw upon foundational and current research in three areas: the Context for Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, Bilingual Methodology, and the Culture of Emphasis.

The Context for Bilingual Education and Bilingualism

Historical, Theoretical and Legal Foundations for Bilingual Education in the United States

Bilingual teacher preparation programs should ensure that teacher candidates are knowledgeable of the rich history regarding the use of languages in addition to English in our schools. Beginning with our nation’s inception, educators have employed languages of diverse linguistic communities in public and private schools throughout the U.S. (Kloss, 1998). Historical and political events in our nation’s history significantly influenced the type and amount of instruction in languages other than English. (Malakoff & Hakuta, 1990, Brisk, 1998, Crawford, 1989). The Bilingual Education Act, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1968, influenced states in developing policies to ensure equal educational opportunities for English Learners (EL). Federal court cases, such as *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) and *Castañeda v. Pickard* (1981) have had a significant impact on language and education policies in the U.S.

Bilingual teacher candidates need to demonstrate a clear understanding of the theoretical foundations, practices, and effects of both additive and deficit theories of bilingual education (Brisk, 1998, Baker, 2005). Bilingual teacher candidates need to be prepared to recognize and to teach in all bilingual program models; models serving students learning English, and models serving English proficient students developing proficiency in a second language.

Bilingual Teacher Education in California: Historical and Policy Perspectives

California has a 35-year history of preparing bilingual teachers. A series of bills beginning with Chacon-Moscone AB 2284 (1972) and AB 1329 (1976), and Chacon AB 507 (1980), which sunset in 1987. Despite the sunset of AB 507, credentialing requirements for bilingual teacher preparation in the state remained intact. Pre-dating the historic *Lau v. Nichols* case of 1974, Chacon-Moscone led to the establishment of policy guidelines by the California Department of Education (CDE) and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). Policy Guidelines addressed compliance issues for K-12 bilingual programs and the adequate preparation of teachers respectively. These guidelines lasted well into the early 1990s, with the development of Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) and Bilingual Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) authorizations as the first major reform in the preparation of teachers of ELs in California. This teacher education policy for ELs in the state continued until 2001, when SB 2042 updated teacher education standards in the state. Standards for both preliminary teacher preparation and induction guided the acquisition and application of knowledge, skills and abilities for teaching in K-12 classrooms. The CLAD-BCLAD option was replaced with the mandate that all general teacher preparation in the state would address the needs of ELs. However, the SB 2042 reform did not address the competencies, skills and standards for bilingual teacher preparation in the state. The Commission passed an interim policy continuing bilingual teacher preparation programs offering the BCLAD option until an advisory panel addressed the issue.

Following the 1998 passage of Proposition 227 (California *Education Code* Sections 300-313), the number of EL students served by K-12 bilingual programs decreased from 30% in 1998 to 6% in 2007 (R-30, CDE). Many universities eliminated bilingual teacher preparation programs. Since SB 2042 did not provide recommendations for updating bilingual teacher preparation standards, in 2005 the Commission convened a Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group. The task for this group was to address policy concerns related to bilingual authorization in light of the SB 2042 reform. The Work Group was reconfigured and convened in 2006 as the Bilingual Certification Design Team. This group had two tasks: 1) to develop Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (KSAs) that would inform the development of the BCLAD Examinations (CSET: LOTE Tests III, IV, and V) and 2) to establish Bilingual Teacher Preparation Program Standards.

The Bilingual Design Team recommended and the Commission concurred that there should be multiple routes for bilingual teacher preparation and authorization. These routes include preliminary teacher preparation, teacher induction, and bilingual authorization for experienced teachers. Examinations in the areas of language, culture and methodology provide an alternate route for bilingual teacher certification and may be combined with coursework to complete the authorization.

Promoting and Developing Language Proficiency for Bilingual Teacher Candidates

The development of language proficiencies for bilingual teachers should take into consideration that teachers need to use both conversational and academic language in English and in the other language of instruction. Bilingual teachers should demonstrate knowledge of syntax, phonology, semantics, and pragmatics, as well as the ability to communicate in both languages through oral, non-verbal, written discourses in a variety of contexts. Bilingual teachers should demonstrate academic language competencies in both languages and in varied ways throughout the continuum of teacher education to maximize biliteracy and bicultural development in their students.

Bilingual Methodologies

Pedagogies for Bilingualism and Biliteracy

Emerging research on biliteracy instruction in the United States is derived from various disciplines including cognitive science (Durán, 1981), neuroscience and brain research (Pettito, et al, 2005), applied and pure linguistics, and reading/biliteracy research (Jiménez, 1997). Cognitive science is concerned with the mental processes in biliteracy, such as schema and metacognition related to the uses and locations of two or more languages in the brain. Bilingual teachers apply this knowledge by incorporating practices, methods and materials that promote the development of bilingualism and biliteracy in their students. Bilingual teacher candidates use metacognitive strategies to both assess and to systematically assist bilingual students in understanding how to bridge between two languages. Teachers need strategies that foster language transference. Bilingual teacher candidates need to know how language skills transfer in order to provide targeted instruction to promote biliteracy.

In order to assess biliteracy and cognitive development, bilingual teachers should recognize that language ability varies from context to context and is influenced by affect, interaction or topic (Valdés and Figueroa, 1994). Thus, teachers must understand that bilingual students, dominant in either the target or primary language, may not yet be able to express their complete knowledge in their second language. Due to these differences, all children cannot be assessed solely by approaches that consider performance in only one language and in only one way (Moll and Díaz, 1987).

Crosscultural/Intercultural Knowledge and Pedagogy

Crosscultural and intercultural knowledge are “...important factors in the acquisition of literacy and reasoning in schools and in the creation and maintenance of conditions of civility in the school social system” (Erickson, 1984 p. 537).

Highly qualified bilingual teachers are important and critical resources to educate and empower American youth for a global society. Bilingual teachers form a cultural and linguistic bridge that links the bilingual community to the larger society. They partner with parents in decisions concerning their children’s education. Students bring valuable resources which include language, culture, and interaction styles that should be ‘tapped into’ in order to maximize learning outcomes. These “funds of knowledge” can be shared by students and teachers and provide culturally relevant opportunities that enhance learning (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Moll & Greenberg, 2005). Friedman (2006) contends that our increasingly global and international economies are dependent on an educated citizenry who can negotiate multiple languages and cultures.

The Learning to Teach Continuum for Bilingual Teachers

The bilingual program standards included in this document are part of the preliminary preparation of bilingual teachers. However, the extension of knowledge, skills and abilities through the induction phase of bilingual teacher preparation has not been considered in this document. According to SB 2042, “a professional teaching credential is earned through completion of a two year professional teacher induction program that begins with the candidates’ initial employment as a teacher of record.” Professional development for bilingual teachers in induction should include mentoring by a support provider who holds a bilingual teaching authorization. The bilingual induction phase should also include opportunities to further develop the teachers’ skills using bilingual curriculum and methodologies.

Section 3: Submission Guidelines

A regionally accredited institution of post-secondary education that would like to offer a program leading to bilingual authorization may present a program proposal that responds to the new standards and preconditions. The submission of programs for review and approval is voluntary for colleges and universities, and only required if an institution is seeking to offer a bilingual authorization program and to recommend candidates for bilingual authorization.

To facilitate the review and approval process, Commission staff have developed the following instructions for organizations submitting bilingual program documents for approval. It is essential that these instructions be followed accurately. Failure to comply with these procedures can result in a proposal being returned to the prospective program sponsor for reformatting and/or revision prior to being forwarded to program reviewers. The program sponsor should first notify CTC of their plan to submit a Bilingual Program and the anticipated date of their submittal by completing the Bilingual Program Information Survey available in Appendix D.

Preparing Responses to Preconditions

The following Preconditions apply to all institutions applying to the Commission for approval to offer programs leading to a Bilingual Teaching Authorization. Institutions must respond to the 10 General Preconditions as well as these additional preconditions.

- 1) Candidates for a Bilingual Authorization must hold a prerequisite teaching credential or be recommended for an acceptable teaching credential simultaneously. The following credentials are acceptable as prerequisite or simultaneous teaching authorizations: Single Subject, Multiple Subjects or Education Specialist teaching credentials or the equivalent.
- 2) The prerequisite teaching authorization must authorize instruction to English learners. Examples of such authorizations include a 2042 authorization, a CLAD or equivalent English Learner Authorization, or the candidate must be eligible for the EL authorization at the time for recommendation for the bilingual authorization. *The Certificate of Completion of Staff Development (CCSD)* [SB 1969 (Chap. 1178, Stats. 1994), SB 395 (Chap. 685, Stats. 1999), AB 2913 (Chap. 169, Stats. 2004)] *is not equivalent to a CLAD authorization.*

Preparing Responses to the Common Standards

The Commission adopted nine standards that relate to institutional resources available to all teacher preparation programs across *all* authorizations and subject matter disciplines:

- | | | |
|----------|---|--|
| Standard | 1 | Educational Leadership |
| Standard | 2 | Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation |
| Standard | 3 | Resources |
| Standard | 4 | Faculty and Instructional Personnel |
| Standard | 5 | Admission |
| Standard | 6 | Advice and Assistance |
| Standard | 7 | Field Experience and Clinical Practice |
| Standard | 8 | District-Employed Supervisors |
| Standard | 9 | Assessment of Candidate Competence |

These standards are referred to as “Common Standards” because they apply to all educator preparation programs. The “Common Standards” require specific institutional mechanisms or infrastructure that could be common to all Commission approved credential and certificate programs. These Common Standards were recently revised and adopted by the Commission in 2008.

If an institution’s full response to the 2008 Common Standards has been submitted, reviewed and approved, then the Institution’s program sponsor need only submit an addendum addressing any information that is specific to the bilingual teacher preparation program relative to the institution’s recently submitted Common Standards.

For example:

- | | | |
|----------|---|--|
| Standard | 1 | Who in the Unit will have <i>leadership</i> responsibilities for this program? |
| Standard | 2 | How will evaluation of this program fit into the <i>Unit Assessment System</i> ? |
| Standard | 3 | How will this program be supported with <i>resources</i> ? |
| Standard | 4 | What will be the criteria for selection of <i>faculty and instructional personnel for this program</i> ? |
| Standard | 5 | Are there particular <i>admission criteria</i> for the bilingual program? |
| Standard | 6 | How will candidates be provided with timely and accurate information about the program? How will candidates requiring additional assistance be <i>guided and supported</i> ? |
| Standard | 7 | What will the <i>field experiences and clinical practice</i> include? How will sites be selected and evaluated? |
| Standard | 8 | What will be the criteria for selection of <i>district-employed supervisors</i> ? |
| Standard | 9 | What will be the program <i>assessments used to determine candidate competence</i> as they move through the program? |

If the institution has not submitted to the revised Common Standards, then a full institution response to the 2008 Common Standards is required in the Bilingual Program Document as in any program documents submitted for approval. If an institution is scheduled for an accreditation site visit within one year of the submission of the Bilingual Authorization program, the submission and review of the institution’s response to the 2008 Common Standards may be delayed until the site visit at the request of the institution. Requests need to be submitted to the Administrator of Accreditation.

Preparing Responses to Program Standards

Program proposals must provide sufficient information about how the program intends to deliver content consistent with each standard so that a knowledgeable team of professionals can determine whether each standard has been met by the program. The goal in writing the response to any standard should be to describe the proposed program clearly enough for an outside reader to understand what a prospective teacher will experience, as he or she progresses through the program in terms of depth, breadth, and sequencing of instructional and field experiences, and what he or she will know and be able to do and demonstrate at the end of the program. Review teams will then be able to assess the responses for consistency with the standard, completeness of the response, and quality of the supporting evidence. Evidence and assessment tools must be incorporated to indicate how the candidate demonstrates competence.



The written text should be organized in the same format as the standard itself. Responses that do not address each portion of each standard will be considered incomplete. Responses should not merely reiterate the standard. They should demonstrate *how* the standard will be met by describing both the content and processes that will be used to implement the program and by providing evidence to support the explanation. Some standards provide **Program Planning Questions** to guide institutions in developing programs that meet the standards. Institutions do not need to develop responses to each Program Planning Question.

Suitable evidence will vary with each standard. Some examples of evidence helpful for review teams include:

- Charts and graphic organizers to illustrate program organization and design
- Descriptions of faculty qualifications, including vitae for full time faculty
- Course or module outlines, or graphic organizers showing the sequence of course topics, classroom activities, materials and texts used, and out-of-class assignments
- Specific descriptions of assignments and other formative assessments that demonstrate how prospective teachers will reinforce and extend key concepts and/or demonstrate an ability or competence
- Documentation of materials to be used, including tables of contents of textbooks and identification of assignments from the texts, and citations for other reading assignments.
- Current catalog descriptions.

Prior to submitting an initial program document, institutions should confirm that all format and content guidelines are followed and that the response to each standard is complete including;

1. Narrative Responses indicating ‘how’ the program meets each sentence of the standard.
2. Evidence clarifying ‘how’ the standards are met including course syllabi, and other documentation.
3. Specifics on ‘how’ candidate competence will be determined including assessment measures.

Standard 6 is unique in that it requires that candidates must demonstrate a range of language competence skills in listening, speaking, reading and writing equivalent to the CSET:LOTE Subject Matter Requirements for Subtest II or III (Domains 5-8), and at a level equivalent to the passing standard for the CSET:LOTE examination. This performance level is set at a minimum of ACTFL Advanced-Low for Western languages and ACTFL Intermediate-High for non-Western languages. Additional guidance for responding to Standard 6 is provided below.

Guidance for Responding to Program Standard 6

A description of the performance levels exemplified by the ACTFL scales is provided in Appendix E. Candidates who complete the program route and those who complete the examination route to establishing their language skills competency should be required to demonstrate an equivalent level of language proficiency skills. If a program chooses to use local assessments for determining the language skills competence of a candidate rather than require candidates to take the CSET examination, the program needs to address the same subject matter requirements in Domains 5-8 as are addressed in the CSET examination. The level and type of

questions that should be included in a local language proficiency skills assessment can be modeled on the examples provided within the subject matter requirements. For example, candidates in the listening skills part of the examination should be required to be able to:

- ◆ Draw conclusions based on information presented in oral messages.
- ◆ Characterize the tone or mood of one or more speakers.
- ◆ Infer the social relationships among speakers (e.g., gender, age, social status).
- ◆ Analyze a personal relationship implied but not stated in an oral communication.
- ◆ Interpret the cultural context of spoken communications.

For another example, candidates in the writing skills part of the examination should be required to be able to:

- ◆ Demonstrate the ability to compose written texts in appropriate orthography and writing systems.
- ◆ Compose personal correspondence.
- ◆ Compose formal correspondence for a variety of purposes and audiences.
- ◆ Write cohesive summaries of a variety of extended written texts (e.g., a newspaper article, an excerpt from a textbook).
- ◆ Write extended narratives and detailed descriptive accounts of events.
- ◆ Formulate and defend a hypothesis in response to a given situation.
- ◆ Describe the reasoning behind a personal or professional decision.
- ◆ Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of an idea or a proposed course of action.
- ◆ Take a position on an issue and support it with persuasive evidence.
- ◆ Demonstrate the ability to write effectively on abstract topics and themes.

It is important to keep in mind that the language skills assessment is not an employment examination but rather a subject matter competence examination.

Programs responding to this standard should also address (a) issues of fairness to candidates, including guidelines for assuring that all candidates are assessed in a similar manner and under similar testing conditions; and (b) assessor training.

For candidates who may complete the program by a combination of CSET: LOTE examination and coursework, the program proposal should clearly indicate which courses will be waived if an individual has passed one or more subtests of the CSET: LOTE examination. A table for a program to indicate which CSET:LOTE subtests and domains are aligned with which courses in the proposed program is provided in Appendix F.

Timeline for Implementation of the Bilingual Program Standards

The bilingual program standards were approved by the Commission on January 31, 2008. Assembly Bill (AB) 1871, (Chap. 660, Stats. 2008) was signed by the Governor on September 30, 2008 enabling multiple routes to bilingual authorization.

Program Sponsor Alert 08-09 (10/29/08) informed institutions and BCLAD programs about the new bilingual program standards and related implementation timelines and processes and included the table of important dates included below. <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PS-alerts/2008/PSA-08-09.pdf>

Coded Correspondence 09-06 (4/1/09) provides guidance on the implementation of Assembly Bill 1871 concerning Bilingual and English Learner Authorizations and clarifies credentialing procedures under the new program standards. <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/notices/coded/2009/0906.pdf>

AB 1871 (Coto) provided for concurrent completion of bilingual authorization with a 2042 program, completion after initial credentialing, and options for completion through a program, examination, or a combination of both. Program Sponsor Alert 09-06 (5/28/09) clarified for institutions the process for recommending candidates for authorization by using a combination of coursework and Commission-approved CTET or CSET: LOTE examinations. <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PS-alerts/2009/PSA-09-06.pdf>

As indicated in the following table of important dates, December 31, 2010 or when an institution's revised program is approved by the COA, whichever occurs first, is the last date that an individual may be accepted into an institution's program approved under the previous Bilingual emphasis program standards.

Important Dates:

Activity	Date
Adoption of the proposed standards by the Commission	January 2008
Program planning and revision activities; document preparation begins	October 2008
AB 1871 (Coto) takes effect	January 1, 2009
Process for review of institutional program documents submitted for approval, including training program reviewers	January 2009 and ongoing
COA approval of revised programs for bilingual authorization	April 2009 and ongoing
Last date to accept an individual into the program approved under the Bilingual Emphasis program standards	December 31, 2010 or when the revised program is approved by the COA, whichever occurs first
Programs that have not been approved under the revised Bilingual Program Standards (2008) are no longer approved preparation programs	December 31, 2011

Programs leading to bilingual authorization must be approved by the Committee on Accreditation (COA). The Committee on Accreditation meeting dates are available on the Commission web site at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-meetings.html>. In order to be placed on the COA's agenda, a prospective Bilingual Authorization program must have completed the review process prior to the scheduled COA meeting. Depending upon the quality of the initial program proposal and the accompanying documentation, the review process can take from six weeks to four months or longer.

To assist program sponsors in planning a timeline for approval of their documents, an example of the activities in the process and the estimated time to complete all steps is provided on the following page:

Planning Timeline for Initial Program Approval

Activity	Timeline
Institutions submit documents	
Commission staff logs documents into database for tracking	7-10 days
Peer Review panel convened	Within 8 weeks of receipt
Feedback submitted to institution	1-3 weeks after first review
Review and revision work completed at institution. Additional information and evidence is submitted to the Commission	TBD at institution
Second review by Review Panel	Within 6 weeks of receipt
(feedback, review by institution, re-submission and review by panel) continued until all adopted program standards are met.)	TBD at institution
Approval of document placed on the agenda for the next meeting of the Committee on Accreditation (COA). *Note: the COA meets six times each calendar year. In order to facilitate planning, you may find the COA meeting dates at: http://www.etc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-meetings.html	Based upon the timing of the COA meetings
Institution must provide the Commission an electronic submission (CD or flash drive) of the final approved program narrative.	To ensure the accuracy of accreditation documents at the Commission, it is requested that the electronic file of the final program narrative be submitted prior to the COA meeting.
Programs notified of approval and may begin program implementation	Those interested can listen to the COA meeting live on the internet to see the program approved. Formal letters will be sent 3-7 days after the COA meeting. Programs may implement upon COA approval.
The entire process can take from 5-10 months or longer.	

Review and Approval of Programs for Bilingual Authorization

Prior to being presented to the Committee on Accreditation for action, new programs proposed by eligible program sponsors are reviewed in relation to the Common Standards in Appendix A and the selected Program Standards in Appendix B. The Committee on Accreditation considers recommendations by the staff and/or the external reviewers regarding the approval of each proposed program. After initial approval of programs, the institution/program sponsor will then participate in accreditation activities at the scheduled times for the institution including the completion of Biennial Reports, Program Assessment, and the Site Visit.

The Commission is committed to conducting a program review process that is objective, authoritative, and comprehensive. The agency also seeks to be as helpful as possible to colleges and universities throughout the review process.

Representatives of an institution can consult directly with the Commission's professional staff regarding programs that are in preparation or under review. The staff will respond to all inquiries expeditiously and knowledgeably, acting as liaison between the review teams and the program sponsors. Representatives of colleges and universities are restricted from direct association with the review teams for their programs.

If the review team determines that minor or technical changes should be made in a program, the responsibility for reviewing the resubmitted document rests with the Commission's professional staff. Upon submission of an updated and complete narrative, the revised program is then presented to the Committee on Accreditation for approval without further review by the panel.

Review of Preconditions

An institution's response to the preconditions is reviewed by the Commission's professional staff because the preconditions are based on Commission policies and do not involve issues of program quality. Preconditions are reviewed upon the institution's formal submission of a document.

Selection, Composition and Training of Program Review Panels

Review panel members are selected because of their expertise in the area of bilingual education. Every program must be reviewed by at least two experts. Reviewers are selected from institutions of higher education, school districts, and county offices of education, professional organizations of English learner and bilingual educators, and statewide education organizations as well as the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR). Because the process is a professional review, the Commission strongly encourages institutions seeking program approval to designate a faculty member to serve as a program reviewer by submitting an application to the BIR, application forms are available on the CTC website at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/BIR.html>. Members are selected according to the Commission's adopted policies governing the selection of panels.

The Commission staff conducts a training and calibration session that all reviewers must attend. Training includes:

- The purpose and function of certification programs for teachers of English learners.
- The Commission's legal responsibilities in program review and approval.
- The role of the reviewers in making program determinations.
- The role of the Commission's professional staff in assisting the process.
- A thorough analysis and discussion of the standards
- Alternative ways in which a standard could be met.
- An overview of review team procedures.
- Guided practice and calibration in reviewing programs
- Constructive feedback for program revision.

Review of Common Standards and Program Standards

The Commission expects the review panel to evaluate responses to each standard by considering 1) the quality and thoroughness of the response, and 2) whether sufficient supporting evidence has been provided by the institution to illustrate how the standard is addressed. For candidate competency standards, supporting evidence should illustrate when and how the standard is addressed in the candidate's program, and what outcomes or assessments will be used by the program to ensure that the candidates have mastered the competencies described.

Reviewers look for the following information:

1. **Does the narrative response to the standard address “how” the standard is being met?** For example: A sentence of the standard might read, “The teacher preparation program further prepares candidates to evaluate, select, use and adapt state-board adopted and state-board approved materials, as well as other supplemental instructional materials.” The narrative might respond, “The teacher preparation program at XYZ College prepares candidates to evaluate, select, use and adapt state-board adopted and state-board approved materials, as well as other supplemental instructional materials.” This does not state HOW the program is accomplishing the standard.
2. **Does the response meet the language of the standard?** Examples: The standard might ask for “multiple, systematic opportunities for candidates to...” The narrative may only provide one example, or the standard states that “candidates are required to demonstrate” and the response indicates that candidates listen to a lecture and read an article but it is unclear **how** candidates “demonstrate” the skill identified in the standard.
3. **Does evidence provided support the narrative response to the standard?** Examples: The narrative notes that candidates complete an assignment in a certain course, but there is no mention of it in the syllabus. Or a specific lesson is taught in order to meet the standard, but it cannot be found in the syllabi representing all sections of the course.

Section 4: Transmittal Instructions

Sponsoring agencies should send the Transmittal Cover Sheet (2 pages) with the original signatures of the program contacts and Chief Executive Officer along with their proposal(s). In addition, each of the copies of each proposal should begin with a copy of the Sponsoring Organization Transmittal Cover Sheet which is included on the following two pages.

The program contact identified on the Transmittal Cover Sheet will be informed electronically of approval of the program documents and updated as changes occur. Program sponsors are strongly urged to consult the Commission website at www.etc.ca.gov for updates relating to requirements for English learner authorizations and certification.

Responses to the standards must:

- Be tabbed/labeled (or organized in folders and subfolders) to help guide the reviewers
- Have numbered pages
- Include a matrix identifying which courses meet which standards
- Include supporting evidence after each response or organized into appendices Evidence should be cross-referenced in the response, and appendices *must* be tabbed for easy access by reviewers

Each proposal must be organized in the following order:

- Transmittal Cover Sheet
- Table of Contents
- Responses to Preconditions
- Responses to Common Standards and Program Standards
- Appendices

Narrative Responses to Standards must include:

- Details on how the program will meet each standard
- Evidence to support each standard

(See Section 3: Submission Guidelines)

Sponsoring agencies are required to submit **one printed copy** of their proposal(s) including evidence and two additional copies on two separate flash drives or CDs, to the following address:

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Professional Services Division:
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attn: Bilingual Program Documents

Packaging a Submission for Shipment to the Commission

Please do **not**:

- Use foam peanuts as packaging material
- Overstuff the binders. Use two binders if necessary.
- Overstuff the boxes in which the binders are packed, as these may break open in shipment.

**Transmittal Cover Sheet
For Response to Standards for Bilingual Authorization**

(Page 1 of 2)

Program Sponsor (Name of Institution and Department)

Complete the information below to help us plan for providing technical assistance in a timely manner.

Contact Person: _____ **Title:** _____

Department: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ **Fax:** _____

Email: _____

Second Contact Person: _____ **Title:** _____

Department: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ **Fax:** _____

Email: _____

Submit to: Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Professional Services Division:
Bilingual Program Authorization
1900 Capitol Ave.
Sacramento, CA 95814
Fax (916) 324-8927

THIS FORM HAS TWO PAGES



Transmittal Cover Sheet
For Response to Standards for Bilingual Authorization

(Page 2 of 2)

Bilingual Authorization Program Sponsor –

Name _____

Title _____

Address _____

Phone _____ Fax _____

E-mail _____

Chief Executive Officer (*President or Provost; Superintendent*):

Name _____

Address _____

Phone _____ *Fax* _____

E-mail _____

**I Hereby Signify My Approval to Transmit This Program Document to the
Commission on Teacher Credentialing:**

CEO Signature _____

Title _____

Date _____



APPENDIX A

Common Standards

Adopted by the Commission, November 2008

Words in *italics* in the Standards will be found in the attached Glossary

Standard 1: Educational Leadership

The *institution* and education *unit* create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. The vision provides direction for *programs*, *courses*, teaching, *candidate performance* and experiences, *scholarship*, *service*, collaboration, and *unit* accountability. The *faculty*, *instructional personnel*, and relevant *stakeholders* are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and *governance* of all professional preparation *programs*. *Unit leadership* has the *authority* and *institutional support* needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all *programs* and represents the interests of each *program* within the *institution*. The education *unit* implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that *candidates* recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation

The education *unit* implements an *assessment and evaluation system* for ongoing *program* and *unit evaluation* and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and *program completer* performance and *unit* operations. *Assessment* in all *programs* includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to *candidate* qualifications, proficiencies, and *competence*, as well as *program* effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

Standard 3: Resources

The *institution* provides the *unit* with the necessary budget, *qualified personnel*, adequate facilities and other *resources* to prepare *candidates* effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient *resources* are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or *certificate* program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and *professional development*, instruction, *field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences*, and *assessment* management. Sufficient *information resources* and related personnel are available to meet *program* and *candidate* needs. A process that is inclusive of all *programs* is in place to determine resource needs.

Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel

Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all *courses*, to provide *professional development*, and to *supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences* in each credential and *certificate program*. *Instructional personnel* and *faculty* have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, *scholarship*, and *service*. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in *P-12 settings/college/university units* and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The *institution* provides *support* for *faculty* development. The *unit* regularly *evaluates* the performance

of *course instructors* and *field supervisors*, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

Standard 5: Admission

In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined *admission criteria* and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. *Multiple measures* are used in an *admission* process that encourages and *supports* applicants from diverse populations. The *unit* determines that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist each *candidate's professional placement*. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The *institution* and/or *unit* provide *support* and assistance to candidates and only retains *candidates* who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

The *unit* and its *partners* design, implement, and regularly *evaluate* a planned sequence of *field-based* and *clinical experiences* in order for *candidates* to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and *support* all *students* effectively so that *P-12 students* meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and *certificate program*, the *unit* collaborates with its *partners* regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective *clinical personnel*, and site-based *supervising personnel*. *Field-based work and/or clinical experiences* provide *candidates* opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help *candidates* develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.

Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors

District-employed supervisors are *certified* and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. A process for selecting *supervisors* who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. *Supervisors* are trained in *supervision*, oriented to the *supervisory role*, *evaluated* and *recognized* in a systematic manner.

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence

Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and *support* effectively all *students* in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. *Assessments* indicate that *candidates* meet the Commission-adopted *competency requirements*, as specified in the program standards.

Common Standard Glossary

Adopted by the COA, October 2008

Term	Common Standard	Definition
Admission Criteria	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate eligibility criteria as defined in the Preconditions for each type of educator preparation program. For example, a key admission criterion for Second Tier credential programs is that the candidate be employed in an appropriate education position.
Assessment	2, 3, 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process to evaluate, appraise, or measure an individual's knowledge, skills and ability in relation in meeting the adopted program standards. • Assessment processes must treat each candidate in a fair and equitable manner according to explicit guidelines published by the institution. • Information gained through assessment for the accreditation process is not used for employment purposes.
Assessment and Evaluation System	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive and integrated set of procedures that measure candidate performance, completer preparedness, and program effectiveness, thereby, allowing an institution to monitor candidate knowledge and skill development, manage academic programs and practica, and identify strengths and weakness of the educator preparation programs and unit.
Authority	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An individual who the institution has granted the power to manage the human and fiscal resources needed to meet all educator preparation program goals. The program authority is usually the dean at an IHE, or an associate superintendent/director for a local education agency.
Candidate	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An individual participating in a credential program, whether for an initial or advanced level credential or authorization. This includes both teaching credentials and services credentials.
Certified, Certificated	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To hold a California educator credential appropriate to his/her role and/or responsibility.
Clinical Experiences	3, 4, 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student teaching, internships, or clinical practices that provide candidates with an intensive and extensive culminating activity. Within the field-based experiences, candidates are immersed in the learning community and are provided opportunities to develop and demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing. Field-based experiences are provided to the candidate under the supervision or guidance of an experienced individual who has the knowledge and skills the candidate is working to attain. • See also Field-Based Experiences
Clinical	3, 4, 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P-12 school personnel or professional education faculty responsible

Term	Common Standard	Definition
Personnel		for instruction, supervision, support, and/or assessment of candidates during field experiences and clinical practice.
Competency Requirements	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The set of knowledge, skills, and abilities that candidates are required to demonstrate, as defined in the applicable program standards.
Course Instructors	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individuals who teach courses and/or provide instruction to candidates.
Courses	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CTC-approved professional preparation provided to candidates under the auspices of an IHE, a local education agency, or other approved services provider. Courses may be offered through organized studies that carry units, and/or through modules, professional development settings, online, or independent study.
District-Employed Supervisors	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applies only to Level I Credential Programs. The master teacher, cooperating teacher, resident teacher, coach, directing teacher, or other designated supervisory personnel who assesses student teachers. In internship programs for Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist credentials, the site support provider, mentor, or coach is considered a district-employed supervisor.
Evaluate, Evaluation	2, 4, 7, 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess candidate knowledge, skills, and performance for the purposes of helping the candidate satisfy the relevant program competency requirements. Does not include evaluation for employment purposes. Analyze data from multiple candidate assessments, program completer surveys, and other stakeholder surveys to identify program strengths and to identify areas needing improvement.
Faculty	1, 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Those individuals employed by a college, university, school district, county office of education, or other CTC-approved entity, including graduate teaching assistants, who teach one or more courses in education, provide services to candidates (e.g., advising, support), provide professional development, supervise clinical experiences, and/or administer some portion of the educator preparation unit.
Field and Clinical Supervisors	4, 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes both district-employed supervisors and those individuals from the CTC-approved program assigned to provide supervision and/or to assess candidates during field experiences and clinical practice. Second Tier Credential Programs do not have field supervisors.
Field-Based Work or Experience	3, 4, 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student teaching, internships, or clinical practices that provide candidates with an intensive and extensive culminating activity. Within the field-based experiences, candidates are immersed in the learning community and are provided opportunities to develop and demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing. Field-based experiences are provided to the candidate

Term	Common Standard	Definition
		under the supervision or guidance of an experienced individual who has the knowledge and skills the candidate is working to attain.
Governance	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The institutional system and structure for defining policy, providing leadership, and managing and coordinating the procedures and resources that ensure the quality of all education professionals prepared at the institution.
Information Resources	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Library and/or digital media resources, as well as information and communication technology resources available to candidates.
Institution	1, 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The university, college, school district, county office of education or other entity approved by the CTC to offer educator preparation programs. An institution may be a regionally accredited (IHE) or a local educational agency (LEA) approved to sponsor educator preparation program(s).
Instructional Personnel	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individuals employed by a college or university, a school district, county office of education or other approved entity who may teach one or more courses to candidates, provide services to candidates such as advising, provide professional development, supervise clinical experiences, and/or administer some portion of the unit.
Intern Program		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A partnership between an approved educator preparation program and an employing school district for the purpose of preparing, supervising, and supporting candidates employed at the school district as educators. Intern programs can be offered for the Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist teaching credentials or the Pupil Personnel or Administrative Services credentials.
P-12 Student	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refers to students enrolled in pre-school through 12th grade.
Multiple Measures	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple sources of information used to determine whether an applicant possesses the requisite personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, communication skills, academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for effectiveness as a professional educator.
P-12	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refers to the entire range of grades in which students are enrolled; preschool through 12th grade.
Partners	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agencies, institutions and others who enter into a voluntary collaborative arrangement to provide services to educator candidates. Examples of partners include departments, schools, county offices of education, and school districts.
Professional Development	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning opportunities for individuals to develop new knowledge and skills such as in-service education, conference attendance, intra- and inter-institutional visits, fellowships, collegial work, and work in P-12 schools.
Professional	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A classroom, clinical or field experience that a candidate participates

Term	Common Standard	Definition
Placement		in during the preparation program. A school site is often a candidate's assigned location for field experiences.
Program	all	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A planned sequence of courses and/or experiences for the purpose of preparing teachers and other school professionals to work in pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade settings, and which leads to a credential.
Program Completer	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An individual who has completed a credential program,
Personnel	3,7, 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals employed by a college or university, a school district, county office of education or other approved entity who may teach one or more courses to candidates, provide services to candidates such as advising, provide professional development, supervise clinical experiences, and/or administer some portion of the unit. • See also Instructional Personnel, Site-Based Supervising Personnel, Clinical Personnel
Qualified Persons, Qualified Members	4, 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals whose background and experience are appropriate for the role to which they are assigned and who receive initial and ongoing professional development consistent with their assigned responsibilities.
Recognize	4, 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To acknowledge and to appreciate the contributions and achievements of another member of the institution or partner organization.
Scholarship	1, 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school professionals, including but not limited to traditional research and publication, the systematic study of pedagogy, action research, and the application of current research findings in new settings.
Second Tier Credential Programs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional preparation programs including Induction, Education Specialist Level II, and Administrative Services Tier II programs which prepare the holder of a first level/tier/preliminary credential to earn a second level credential.
Service	1, 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty contributions to college or university activities, P-12 settings, communities and professional associations in ways consistent with the individual's specialized knowledge and the institution and unit's mission as preparers of educators.
Site-Based Supervising Personnel	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those individuals from the CTC-approved program or employing district assigned to provide supervision and/or to assess candidates during field experiences and clinical practice. This does not apply to Second Tier Credential Programs. • See Also Field and Clinical Supervisors.
Stakeholder	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any individual or institution such as a college, university, or school

Term	Common Standard	Definition
		district that is impacted by and/or that has a professional interest in an educator preparation program or institution.
Student	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the context of educator preparation programs, a student is considered to be an individual enrolled in a district or county office of education preschool, kindergarten through 12th grade, or adult education program.
Sufficient	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate or ample to meet the need.
Supervise	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The act of guiding, directing, and evaluating candidates in a credential program. This activity does not apply to evaluation for employment purposes.
Supervisor	4, 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For intern programs, those individuals from the CTC-approved program or employing district assigned to provide supervision and/or to assess candidates during field experiences and clinical practice. This does not apply to Second Tier Credential Programs. See Also Field and Clinical Supervisors.
Supervision	3, 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities undertaken to evaluate a candidate's competence by a qualified person designed to assist a candidate in mastering the required knowledge, skills and abilities expected of the candidate.
Support	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aid provided by a qualified individual to a candidate in his/her early teaching or service that includes collecting evidence relating to the candidate's competence for the purpose of helping the candidate satisfy knowledge and skill requirements, but who does not supervise or evaluate the candidate.
Unit	1, 6, 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The college, school, department, or other administrative body in colleges, universities, school districts, county offices of education, or other organizations with the responsibility for managing and coordinating all aspects of CTC-approved educator preparation programs offered for the initial or advanced preparation of educators, regardless of where these programs are administratively housed in an institution.
Unit Leadership	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individuals designated by the institution to be responsible for administering all aspects of the CTC-approved educator preparation programs offered by the institution, and who have been granted, by the institution, the authority to manage the human and fiscal resources needed to meet all educator preparation program goals. The program authority is usually the dean at an IHE, or a director of teacher education, district superintendent or county office program director.

Italics indicate that the term does not appear in the Common Standards.

APPENDIX B

Program Standards for Bilingual Authorization

Standard 1: Program Design

The design of the professional bilingual teacher preparation program follows from an explicit statement of program philosophy and purpose and is coordinated effectively in accordance with a cohesive design that has a cogent rationale. The program philosophy articulates a clear understanding of the instructional needs of learners in bilingual settings. The sponsoring institution shows a high priority to the program by providing appropriate support for the program and a demonstrated commitment to teacher preparation and to bilingual education. The program has a leadership team whose members are qualified in the areas of teacher preparation and bilingual instruction. The program demonstrates initial and ongoing collaboration with local school districts in order to reflect the needs of teachers serving in bilingual programs at the local and state level. This on-going coordination between the bilingual program and other teacher development programs is designed to strengthen the learning-to-teach continuum for teachers of learners in bilingual classroom. The curriculum is designed around the Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (KSAs) for Bilingual Methodology and Culture. It provides candidates with a depth of knowledge regarding current research-based theories and research in academic and content literacy in two languages, building upon both SB 2042 and California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) competencies. The program shows candidates how to help learners to access the K-12 grade level content instruction and how to provide benchmarks of English Learners' progress toward meeting standards as defined in the California Curriculum Frameworks (2006). The design of the program clearly indicates the options for completion of the program in a concurrent model and/or as a post-credential model.

Standard 2: Assessment of Candidate Competence

Prior to recommending each candidate for a bilingual authorization, one or more persons responsible for the program determine on the basis of thoroughly documented evidence that each candidate has demonstrated a satisfactory performance on the full range of program standards including language proficiency as they apply to bilingual authorization. During the program, candidates are guided and coached on their performance in bilingual instruction using formative assessment processes. Verification of candidate's performance is provided by both institutional and field-based individuals with bilingual expertise and/or possessing bilingual authorization.

Standard 3: The Context for Bilingual Education and Bilingualism

The professional bilingual teacher preparation program provides candidates with knowledge of the history, policies, programs, and research on the effectiveness of bilingual education and bilingualism in the United States. The program develops candidates who demonstrate understanding of the philosophical, theoretical, legal and legislative foundations of bilingual education and their effects on program design and educational achievement.

Candidates apply knowledge of the research on the cognitive effects of bilingualism and biliteracy as developmental processes in instructional practice. Candidates understand and apply research and its effects on the dimensions of learning in bilingual education program models. The program prepares candidates' knowledge of the transferability between primary and target language with the understanding that the level of transferability is affected by the level of compatibility and may vary among languages.

The program prepares candidates to actively promote authentic parental participation that includes learning about school systems, assuming leadership roles and affecting policy. The program promotes candidates' understanding of the family as a primary language and cultural resource. Candidates are cognizant that students' motivation, participation and achievement are influenced by an intercultural classroom climate and school community.

PROGRAM PLANNING QUESTIONS

- 3.1 How does the program ensure that candidates develop understanding of the philosophical, theoretical, and research bases for bilingual education, including knowledge of the historical and legal foundations of bilingual education in the United States (e.g., Elementary and Secondary Education Act [ESEA], *Lau v. Nichols*, *Castañeda v. Pickard*) and California (e.g., *Méndez v. Westminster*, Proposition 227, *Williams v. State of California*) and their effects on bilingual education programs?
- 3.2 How does the program ensure that candidates can analyze the effects and impact of federal, state and local policies on the measurement of educational achievement of students in bilingual programs?
- 3.3 How does the program help candidates to develop understanding of the theoretical foundations, practice, limitations, and effects of the deficit perspective of bilingual education (e.g., viewing the primary language as an obstacle, limiting use of the primary language, promoting assimilation in the target culture) and the enrichment perspective of bilingual education (e.g., viewing the primary language as a right and an asset, promoting the development of bilingualism and biculturalism, promoting acculturation to the target culture)?
- 3.4 How does the program provide guidance for philosophical, theoretical, and research bases for bilingual education, including the characteristics, components, benefits, and limitations of research-based program models of bilingual education (e.g., dual-language, one-way immersion, two-way immersion, transitional bilingual education, maintenance bilingual education, heritage language education)?



- 3.5 What components of the program prepare candidates to develop and apply knowledge of metacognitive and metalinguistic processes (e.g., choosing the appropriate language to use in a given situation, evaluating similarities and differences between languages, transferring linguistic knowledge between languages) and roles of code-switching, language mixing and interlanguage in the development of bilingualism and biliteracy?
- 3.6 What components of the program support teachers to understand brain research on the developmental processes of bilingualism and biliteracy, and apply knowledge for appropriate language use and usage (e.g., translation, language allocation by program model) when interacting with students at different developmental stages of bilingualism and biliteracy?
- 3.7 How does the program develop each candidates' understanding of the transferability of language and literacy skills and the acquisition of content and context knowledge between the primary and target languages, including ways in which language transfer can be affected by the level of compatibility between the primary and target language?
- 3.8 How does the program incorporate opportunities for candidates to apply knowledge of the use of contrastive analysis (i.e., comparing and contrasting similarities and differences, including nonexistent features, in the phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, and usage of different languages) to facilitate development of listening, speaking, reading, and writings skills in the primary and target language?
- 3.9 How does the program prepare candidates to enhance school-home partnerships, and assist in identifying and using community resources? (i.e., candidates support families to contribute their knowledge to culturally inclusive institutions and participate in school forums and organizations)
- 3.10 How does the program prepare candidates for effective, two-way communication with families through the appropriate medium (e.g. parent conferences, phone, home visits, written communication, e-mail, and videos in the primary language) on matters of students success, the family's educational goals, guidance, notification of rights, placement and program options; understanding student achievement and assessment results; parent roles in supporting student achievement; school and district policies and parent opportunities to influence school policy?
- 3.11 How does the program promote the candidates' understanding of cultural influences on learning and teaching in bilingual program settings and the understanding of the effects of intercultural communication on school/community climate, student motivation, participation and achievement?



Standard 4: Bilingual Methodology

The bilingual teacher preparation program prepares bilingual candidates to understand the interrelatedness among the four domains of language (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) and to know language forms and functions. The program also prepares candidates to plan, develop, implement and assess standards-aligned content instruction in the primary and target language. Candidates are prepared to employ a variety of instructional and assessment strategies, appropriate to student language proficiency levels, that foster higher-order thinking skills. The program ensures that bilingual candidates have knowledge of bilingual instructional models, instructional strategies and materials to appropriately apply them to their instructional and assessment practices. In addition, programs develop bilingual candidates' understanding of knowledge of intercultural communication and interaction that is linguistically and culturally responsive. The bilingual teacher preparation program further prepares candidates to evaluate, select, use and adapt state-board adopted and state-board approved materials, as well as other supplemental instructional materials. The program provides opportunities for teacher candidates to demonstrate the ability to use a variety of criteria for selection of instructional materials, to assess the suitability and appropriateness for local context and to augment resources when they are not suitable or available.

PROGRAM PLANNING QUESTIONS

- 4.1 How does the program design and develop the candidates' understanding of the applications, benefits and limitations of different bilingual program models?
- 4.2 How does the program provide candidates the understanding of ways in which variations in students' primary languages (e. g, dialectal and/or tonal differences, use of vernacular forms) can be used to facilitate the development of social and academic language?
- 4.3 How does the program ensure that candidates apply knowledge of language structures (e.g., word roots, prefixes, suffixes), forms (e.g., registers) and functions (e.g., informing, describing, persuading) to develop and deliver effective language and literacy instruction in the primary and target languages?
- 4.4 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate knowledge of literary analysis in appropriate genres and forms, and their significance for planning, organization, and delivery including strategies to provide differentiated instruction in primary and target language instruction based on student proficiency levels.
- 4.5 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate understanding of the roles, purposes and uses of standardized and non-standardized primary and target language assessments in bilingual education settings in order to interpret the results to plan, organize, modify and differentiate instruction in the appropriate language(s) in bilingual education settings?
- 4.6 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate the ability to evaluate and incorporate technology to develop students' literacy in the primary and target languages as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of technology for literacy development?
- 4.7 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate knowledge of strategies for aligning instruction with California K-12 content standards and frameworks appropriate to grade-level expectations and students' language proficiency in the primary and target languages?



- 4.8 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate understanding of the interrelatedness of language and literacy development in order to plan, select and use a variety of strategies for developing students' content-area knowledge and skills in bilingual education settings including language and grade-level content objectives in lesson, providing linguistic scaffolding and activating background knowledge and experiences?
- 4.9 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate understanding of a variety of instructional approaches that foster student engagement and interaction and the development of higher-order thinking skills (e.g., analysis, inference, synthesis, evaluation) and facilitate students' understanding and use of content-specific language functions (e.g., analyzing, comparing and contrasting, persuading, citing evidence, making hypotheses) in oral and written forms of the primary and target language?
- 4.10 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate understanding of ways in which students' life experiences (immigrant or refugee experience, prior educational experiences, oral tradition), language development, and language variations can be used to foster content learning in the primary and target languages?
- 4.11 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate the ability to select, develop and/or adapt, administer and interpret a variety of content assessments in order to plan, organize and differentiate instruction in bilingual settings?
- 4.12 How does the program ensure that candidates have the ability to reflect upon and implement effective practice that fosters the development of biliteracy through content instruction?
- 4.13 How does the program promote the candidates' understanding of central concepts of intercultural communication including patterns of nonverbal communication, oral and written discourse and origins of dialectical and/or tonal variations and their influence on standard academic language development?
- 4.14 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate the ability to review and evaluate materials, to identify potential areas of offense or bias (e.g., race, class, gender, religion, country of origin) and to ensure appropriate representation of linguistic and cultural diversity within and across language and cultural groups?
- 4.15 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate the ability to develop, adapt, evaluate, and/or align primary and target language materials, content standards and curriculum frameworks?
- 4.16 How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate the ability to evaluate and select state-adopted and state-approved textbooks, and supplementary materials in primary and target language for bilingual education settings based on a variety of criteria including appropriateness for instructional purpose, alignment with curriculum, student and community needs and level of academic language?



Standard 5: Culture of Emphasis

The professional bilingual teacher preparation program develops candidates' knowledge of the traditions, roles, status, and communication patterns of the culture of emphasis as experienced in the country or countries of origin and in the United States. Included in that knowledge is the understanding of crosscultural, intercultural and intracultural relationships and interactions, as well as contributions of the culture of emphasis in California and the United States. Also included is the knowledge of major historical events, political, economic, religious, and educational factors that influence the socialization and acculturation experiences of the target groups in the California and the U.S. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the country/countries of origin, including geographic barriers, demographic and linguistic patterns, and the ways in which these affect trends of migration, immigration and settlement in the United States.

PROGRAM PLANNING QUESTIONS

- 5.1 How does the program curriculum develop the candidates' knowledge and understanding of significant geographic, demographic, sociocultural and economic factors of the country/ countries of origin and the effect these factors have on language, cultural and social variations within the culture of emphasis in California and the U.S.?
- 5.2 How does the program's curriculum account for the candidates' understanding of historical and contemporary immigration/migration and settlement/resettlement patterns among the culture of emphasis in the country/countries of origin and the United States, including the influence of economic globalization patterns?
- 5.3 How does the program's curriculum provide candidates with knowledge of the major historical eras, movements and developments of the country/countries of origin and help the candidates to analyze and understand the influences of those historical events on the culture of emphasis in California and the U.S.?
- 5.4 How does the program help candidates to recognize the primary social and political structures within the country/countries of origin, and demonstrate understanding of the beliefs, values, and contributions of various groups, including indigenous populations, to the culture of emphasis in California and the U.S.?
- 5.5 How does the program curriculum prepare the candidates regarding the effects of historical and social factors (e.g., economic, political, religious, class structure) of the country/countries of origin and help the candidates to analyze and understand the influences of these factors on the culture of emphasis in California and the U.S.?
- 5.6 How does the program prepare candidates to understand that the roles and status of an individual (i.e., economic, gender, racial, ethnic, social class, age, education level) influence inter- and intracultural relationships and how those factors affect the process of acculturation in California and the U.S.?
- 5.7 How does the program prepare candidates to demonstrate understanding of the educational system in the country/countries of origin and how they are able to analyze ways in which these systems and structures have influenced their involvement in schools of the United States?

Standard 6: Assessment of Candidate Language Competence

The institution must verify, during the program or at its completion that the candidate has attained, in listening, speaking, reading and writing a language proficiency level that is equivalent to the passing standard on the appropriate CSET: LOTE language examination. The program creates clear guidelines by which the candidate will be assessed.

PROGRAM PLANNING QUESTIONS

- 6.1 Is the program using the CSET: LOTE examination or local assessment to meet this standard?

If the program chooses local assessment of candidate language skills competencies;

- 6.2 What measures are used? What are the characteristics and types of these measures?
- 6.3 How does the program ensure that each candidate being recommended for the authorization meets the appropriate language proficiencies?
- 6.4 How does the program assure that all candidates are assessed in a fair and equitable manner?

APPENDIX C

Resources for the Preparation of Bilingual Educators

- Acuña, R. (1988). *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Aguila, Veronica. (In Press) Schooling English Learners: Contexts and Challenges. *Educating English Learners: Research-Based Approaches*. Sacramento: California Department of Education. 2009.
- Anaya, R. (1972). *Bless Me, Ultima*. Berkeley: Tonatiuh-Quinto Sol International, Inc.
- Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Bankston, C., & Zhou, M. (1995). Effects of Minority-language Literacy on the Academic Achievement of Vietnamese in New Orleans. *Sociology of Education*, 68, 1–17.
- Beykont, Z., Editor. (2000). *Lifting Every Voice: Pedagogy and Politics of Bilingualism*. MA: Harvard Publishing Group.
- Boyer, J., & Baptiste, H., Jr. (1996). The crisis in teacher education in America: Issues of recruitment and retention of culturally different (minority) teachers. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed, pp. 779–794). New York: Schuster Macmillan.
- Brisk, M.E. (1998). *Bilingual Education: From Compensatory to Quality Schooling*. New Jersey: Earlbaum.
- Burns, A.F. (1993). *Maya in Exile: Guatemalans in Florida*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Cadiero-Kaplan, K. (2004). *The Literacy Curriculum and Bilingual Education: A Critical Examination*. New York: Peter Lang
- California Dept. of Education, 2009. (In Press) *Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches*. Sacramento, California Department of Education
- California Law: California Education Code (2009). Sections 300-313. Accessed at: <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/calawquery?codesection=edc&codebody=&hits=20> on March 6, 2009.
- Caplan, N., Choy, M. H., & Whitmore, J. K. (1991). *Children of the Boat People: A Study of Educational Success*. Ann Harbor: University of Michigan Press.



- Caplan, N., Whitmore, J. K., & Choy, M. (1989). *The boat people and achievement in America: A study of family life, hard work, and cultural values*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M. & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching: A Guide for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press, UK.
- Chang, E. & Diaz-Veizades, J. (1999). *Ethnic Peace in the American City*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Cheng, L. & Yang, P. (2000). In M. Zhou & J. Gatewood (Eds.). *Contemporary Asian America: A multidisciplinary reader*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Chun, K. T. (1980). The Myth of Asian American Success and its Educational Ramifications. *IRCD Bulletin* (Winter/Spring, 1980): 1-12. Teachers College, Columbia University: Clearinghouse on Urban Education.
- Corson, D. (1998). *Language Policies in Schools*. England: Multilingual Matters.
- Crawford, J. (1989). *Bilingual education: History, Politics, Theory, and Practice*. Trenton, NJ: Crane Publishing
- Crawford, J. (2000). *At War with Diversity: US Language Policy in an Age of Anxiety*. England: Multilingual Matters.
- Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English Learners: Language Diversity in the Classroom*. Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Education Services
- Darder, A., Torres, R. & Gutiérrez, H. (1997). *Latinos and Education: A Critical Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Delgado-Gaitan, Concha. (1994). *Sociocultural change through literacy: Toward the empowerment of families*.
- Durân, R.** (1981). Editor. *Latino language and the Metaset*, NJ: Norwood Press.
- Escobedo, D. (1999). Propositions 187 and 227: Latino immigrant rights to education. *Human Rights Magazine* (summer), pp. 13–15. Faltis, C. & Hudelson, S. (1998). *Bilingual Education in Elementary and Secondary School Communities: Toward Understanding and Caring*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Espiritu, Y. L. (1992). *Asian American Panethnicity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy* (pp. 1–40). New York: Longman.



- Ferdman, B., Weber, R. & Ramirez, A. (eds.), *Literacy across Languages and Cultures*. Albany: University of New York Press.
- Freeman, D. & Freeman, Y. (2007). *La enseñanza de la lectura y escritura en español en el aula bilingüe*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Freidman, T.L. (2006) *The World is Flat 3.0: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Picador Publishers.
- García, O. & Otheguy, R. (1988). The Language Situation of Cuban Americans. In: S. McKay & S. Wong, *Language Diversity: Problem or Resource?* Boston: Heinle & Heinle, Inc.
- Gergen, K. J. (1991). *The Saturated Self: Dilemmas of Identity in Contemporary Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gonzalez, N., Moll, L. & Amanti, C. (2005) *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing Practices in Households, Communities and Classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ.: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Goodwin, A., L., Genishi, C., Asher, N., & Woo, K. A. (1997). Voices from the Margins: Asian American Teachers' Experiences in the Profession. In D. M. Byrd & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Teacher Education Yearbook* (Vol. 5, pp. 219–241). Thousand Oaks, CA: Association of Teacher Educators and Corwin Press.
- Gordon, J. (1994). Why Students of Color are not Entering Teaching: Reflections from Minority Teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 45, 346–353.
- Gordon, J. (2000). Asian American Resistance to Selecting Teaching as a Career: The Power of Community and Tradition. *Teachers College Record*, 102(1), 173–196.
- Guyton, E., & McIntyre, D. J. (1990). Student Teaching and School Experiences. *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and Agency in Cultural Worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hsu, S. (2005). *Help-seeking Behavior of Student Teachers*. *Educational Research*, 47(3), 308–318.
- Ima, K. & Rumbaut, R. G. (1989). Southeast Asian Refugees in American schools: A comparison of fluent-English-proficient and limited-English-proficient students. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 9:3.
- Jimenez, R.T. (1997). The Strategic Reading Abilities and Potential of Five Low-Literacy Latina/o Readers in Middle School. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 32(3), 224-243.



- Johnson, D. M. (1992). *Approaches to Research in Second Language Learning*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Kitano, H. (1969). *Japanese Americans: The Evolution of a Subculture*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Kloss, Heinz. (1998). *The American Bilingual Tradition. Language in Education: Theory and Practice* No.88 . Washington D.C.: Eric Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). Who will Teach our Children? Preparing Teachers to Teach African American Learners. In E. Hollins, J. King, & W. Hayman (Eds.), *Teaching Diverse Learners: Formulating a Knowledge Base for Teaching Diverse Populations* (pp. 129–158). Albany, NY: State University Press.
- Lavadenz, M. (2005). Como Hablar en Silencio: Culture and Language Identity of Central Americans in Los Angeles. In: Zentella, A. *Latinos and Language Socialization in Families, Communities, and Schools: Anthro-political Perspectives*. NY: SUNY Press.
- Lavadenz, M & Duque de Reyes, S. (2001-Segunda Edición). *Los Estándares de Lecto-Escritura en Español, K-12*. San Diego, CA: San Diego County Office of Education.
- Lemlech, J. K., & Hertzog-Foliart, H. (1993, Fall). Linking School and University through Collegial Student Teaching. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 20(4), 19–28.
- Lindholm-Leary, K, and Genesee, F., (In Press) Dual Language Programs for English Learners. *Educating English Learners: Research-Based Approaches*. Sacramento: California Department of Education. 2009.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2001). *Dual Language Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lipman, P. (1998). *Race, class, and Power in School Restructuring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press
- Lippi-Green, R. (2001). *English with an Accent*. New York: Routledge, Inc.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975).
- López, G. R., Scribner, J. D., & Mahitivanichcha, K. (2001). Redefining Parental Involvement: Lessons from High-Performing Migrant-Impacted Schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38, 253-288.
- Olivios, E. (2006). *The Power of Parents*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Macclure, M. (1993). Arguing for Your Self: Identity as an organization principle in teachers' Jobs and Lives. *British Educational Research Journal*, 19, 311–322.

- Makaroff, J. (1967). America's Other Racial Minority: Japanese Americans. *Contemporary Review*, 210: 310-314.
- Malakoff, M. & Hakuta, K. (1990). History of Language Minority Education in the United States. In: A. Padilla, H. Fairchild, & C. Valadez (Eds.), *Advances in Language Education: Theory, Research, and Practice*. New York: Sage Publications.
- Manning, D. T. (1977). The Influence of Key Individuals on Student Teachers in Urban and Suburban Settings. *The Teacher Educator*, 13(2), 2-8.
- Martinez, R. R., & O'Donnell, J. (1993, April). *Understanding the Support Systems of Hispanic Teacher Candidates: A study through In-depth Interviews*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA, April 12-16.
- McKay, S. L., & Wong, S. L. C. (Eds.). (1996). *New Immigrants in the United States*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mitchell, A. (1998). African American teachers. Unique Roles and Universal Lessons. *Education and Urban Society*, 31(1) 104-122.
- Moll, L.C., & Diaz, R. (1987) Changes as the Goal of Educational Research. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18(4), 300-311.
- Moll, L. & Greenberg, J.B. (2005). Creating Zones of Possibilities: Combining Social Contexts for Instruction. In *Vygotsky and Education: Instructional Implications and Applications of Sociocultural Psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nguyen, D. H. (1972). *Some Aspects of Vietnamese Culture*. Carbondale, IL: Center for Vietnamese Studies, University of Southern Illinois.
- Nguyen, H. T. (2008a). Conceptions of Teaching by Five Vietnamese American Preservice Teachers, *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 7(2), 113 -136.
- Nguyen, H. T. (2007). Educating Vietnamese American Students. *Multicultural Education*, 15(1), 23-26.
- Nguyen, M. H., & Haines, D. W. (1996). Vietnamese. In: D. W. Haines (Ed.), *Refugees in America in the 1990s: A Reference Handbook* (pp. 305-330). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. (2002, July 11). *Summary and Overview*. Retrieved March 25, 2003 from <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/esea/summary.html>
- Romaine, S. (1999). *Bilingualism*. Oxford University Press: England.



- Petitto, L.A. (2005). How the Brain Begets Language: On the Neural Tissue Underlying Human Language Acquisition. In J. McGilvray (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Chomsky*, (pp. 84-101). England: Cambridge University Press.
- Rong, X. L., & Preissle, J. (1997). The Continuing Decline in Asian American Teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34(2), 267–293.
- Rumberger, R.W. & Gandara, P. (2004). Seeking Equity in the Education of California’s English learners. *Teachers College Record*, 106, 10, pp. 2032–2056. New York, NY: Columbia University.
- Su, Z. (1996). Why Teach: Profiles and Entry Perspectives of Minority Students as Becoming Teachers. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 29(3), 117–133.
- Santa Ana, O.(1993). Chicano English and the Nature of the Chicano Language Setting. *The Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, V 15, N 1. California: Sage Publications
- Seperson, M. A., & Joyce, B. R. (1973). Teaching Styles of Student Teachers as Related to those of Cooperating Teachers. *Educational Leadership Research Supplement* 146–151.
- Shoris, E. (1992). *Latinos: A Biography of the People*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Soltero, S.W. (2004). *Dual Language: Teaching and Learning in two languages*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Thomas, WP & Collier, VP (2002). *A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students’ Long Term Academic Achievement. Final Report*. Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education Diversity & Excellence.
- Tierney, W. G. (2002). Parents and families in precollege preparation: The lack of connection between research and practice. *Educational Policy*, 16, 588-606.
- Valdés, G. (2001). *Learning and Not Learning English: Latino Students in American Schools*. Teachers College Press: NY.
- Valdés, G. (1988). The Language Situation of Mexican-Americans. In: S. McKay & S.Wong. *Language Diversity: Problem or Resource?* Boston: Heinle & Heinle, Inc.
- Valdés, G. & Figueroa, R. (1994). *Bilingualism and Testing: a Special Case of Bias*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(2), 143–178.



- Villegas, A. M. (1996). Increasing the Racial and Ethnic Diversity in the U.S. Teaching Force. In B. Biddle, T. Good, & I. Goodson (Eds.), *International Handbook on Teachers and Teaching*. The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Winitsky, N., Stoddart, T., & O'Keefe, P. (1992). Great Expectations: Emergent Professional Development Schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(1), 52–65.
- Wollenberg, C. (1975). *All deliberate speed: Segregation and exclusion in California schools, 1855–1975*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Yee, A. H. (1969). Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, LX, 327.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, M. J. (1990). Teacher Socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 329–348). New York: Macmillan.
- Zentella, A.C. (1988). The Language Situation of Puerto Ricans. In: S. McKay & S. Wong. *Language Diversity: Problem or Resource?* Boston: Heinle & Heinle, Inc.
- Zentella, A. (2005). *Latinos and Language Socialization in Families, Communities, and Schools: Anthro-political Perspectives*. NY: SUNY Press.



APPENDIX D
Bilingual Program Information Survey

Please complete the following:

Sponsor

Contact Name

Phone

e-mail

Currently we:

_____ Plan to submit a program leading to bilingual authorization

We expect the submission to be sent to the CTC in the month/year: _____

_____ Are considering submitting a program leading to bilingual authorization

We expect to make a decision in the month/year: _____

_____ We are not planning to submit a program leading to bilingual authorization at this time.

Please return this information by **August 1, 2008** to Paula Jacobs

By e-mail:

pjacobs@ctc.ca.gov

Thank you.



APPENDIX E

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) PROFICIENCY STANDARDS

ACTFL PROFICIENCY STANDARDS: LISTENING

Intermediate-Low

Able to understand full length spoken sentences in content areas referring to personal background, personal needs, and routine social practices (ordering meals, receiving instructions, and receiving directions). Listening is primarily fact to face. Understanding is often uneven; repetition and rewording may be necessary. Misunderstandings arise frequently.

Intermediate-Mid

Able to understand full length spoken sentences in additional content areas referring to more difficult tasks (lodging, transportation, and shopping), personal interests, activities, and greater diversity of receiving instructions and directions. Listening tasks will also pertain to short routine telephone conversations and some deliberate speech (simple announcements and news reports) Understanding continues to be uneven.

Intermediate-High

Able to understand longer stretches of dialogue on additional content areas pertaining to different times and places. Understanding may be inconsistent due to difficulty in grasping main ideas and/or details. Topics are not significantly different from an Advanced level listener, but comprehension will be poorer.

Advanced

Able to understand main ideas and most details of longer stretches of dialogue on a variety of topics that may fall outside of the immediate situation, however comprehension may be uneven due to topic familiarity or other factors. Dialogue will frequently involve different time frames (present, past, regularly occurring, or seldom occurring), and may include interviews, short lectures on familiar topics, and reports on factual information. Listener is aware of cohesive devices, but may not be able to use them to follow the sequence of thought when listening.

Advanced Plus

Able to understand the main ideas of most speech in the standard dialect, however it may be difficult to sustain understanding during lengthy or especially complex communication. Listener is beginning to become aware of culturally implied meanings beyond the surface meanings of the dialogue, but may fail to understand the subtle sociocultural meanings in the message.

Superior

Able to understand the main ideas of all speech in the standard dialect, including technical discussion in a particular field of specialization (academic/ professional settings, lectures, speeches, and reports). Listener shows some appreciation of aesthetic norms (idioms, colloquialisms, register shifting), and can understand subtle sociocultural meanings. Rarely misunderstand, except during fast paced, highly colloquial speech, or speech with highly strong cultural references.

Distinguished

Able to understand virtually all forms and styles of speech, has a strong understanding of social and cultural references. Understands plays, movies, academic debates, literary readings, and most jokes and puns. May have some difficulty with non standard dialects and slang.



ACTFL PROFICIENCY STANDARDS: SPEAKING

Intermediate-Low

Able to successfully handle limited, face-to-face, conversation involving tasks and social situations such as introducing self, ordering meals, asking directions, and making purchases. Strong inference from native language may occur and misunderstands are frequent.

Intermediate-Mid

Able to successfully handle a variety of simple conversation involving tasks and social situations beyond their most immediate needs (personal history, leisure time activities). Speech length increases slightly, but frequent long pauses are likely. Pronunciation may still be strongly influenced by native language. Misunderstandings still arise.

Intermediate-High

Able to successfully handle most simple conversations involving task and social situations, as well as general conversation on a range of circumstances and topics. Errors are evident and limited vocabulary may cause speaker to hesitate and ramble. Simple narration and/or description is improved.

Advanced

Able to successfully handle conversations required in everyday situations, and routine school and work requirements. Complicated tasks and social situations (elaborating, complaining, apologizing) may still be difficult. Can narrate and describe with some details, linking sentences together smoothly. Can communicate facts and talk casually about topics of current public and personal interest, using general vocabulary. Weaknesses can be smoothed over by pause fillers and different rates of speech. Some groping for words may still be evident.

Advanced Plus

Able to successfully handle a broad variety of everyday, school, and work conversations, as well as discuss concrete topics relating to interests and special fields of competence. Speaker is beginning to be able to support opinions, explain in detail, and hypothesize. Has a well-developed ability to compensate for weaknesses by paraphrasing. Can communicate fine shades of meaning with inflection and differentiated vocabulary.

Superior

Able to speak the language with sufficient accuracy to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional, and abstract topics. Can discuss special fields of competence and interest with ease. Can support opinions and hypothesize, but may not be able to tailor language to audience or discuss in depth highly abstract or unfamiliar topics. Speaker commands a wide variety of interactive strategies and shows good awareness of discourse strategies. Can distinguish main ideas from supporting information. No patterns of error are evident.

ACTFL PROFICIENCY STANDARDS: READING

Intermediate-Low

Able to understand main ideas and/or some facts from the simplest text about basic personal and social needs. Examples of texts include messages with social purposes and information for the widest possible audiences, such as public announcements and short, straightforward instructions dealing with public life. Some misunderstandings will occur.

Intermediate-Mid

Able to read consistently with increased understanding simple texts dealing with basic personal and social needs about which the reader has personal interest and/or knowledge. Texts provide basic information and guesswork is minimal for the reader. Examples include short, straightforward descriptions of persons, places, and things written for a wide audience.

Intermediate-High

Able to read consistently with full understanding simple texts dealing with basic personal and social needs about which the reader has personal interest and/or knowledge. Can understand some main ideas from texts at next higher level featuring description and narration. Basic grammatical relations may be misinterpreted. Tests do not differ significantly from those at the Advanced level, comprehension is less consistent. May have to read several times for understanding.

Advanced

Able to read longer prose with familiar sentence patterns. Reader gets the main ideas and facts, may miss some detail. Comprehension comes from situational and subject matter knowledge as well as increasing control of the language. Texts include descriptions and narrations such as simple short stories, news items, social notices, correspondence, and simple technical material written for the general reader.

Advanced Plus

Able to follow essential points at the Superior level in areas of special interest or knowledge. Able to understand parts of texts which are conceptually abstract and have complex language, and/or texts with unfamiliar topics, situations, or cultural references. Awareness of aesthetic properties of languages is emerging permitting comprehension of a wider variety of texts. Misunderstandings may occur.

Superior

Able to read with almost complete comprehension at normal speed on unfamiliar subjects and a variety of texts. Readers is not expected to thoroughly comprehend texts requiring a high degree of knowledge of the target culture. Texts feature hypotheses, argumentation, grammatical patterns, and academic/professional vocabulary. Occasional misunderstandings may still occur due to use of uncommon phrases. Material includes a variety of literary texts, editorials, correspondence, general reports, and technical material in professional fields. Rereading is rarely necessary.

Distinguished

Able to read fluently and accurately most styles and forms. Able to understand references in text to real-world knowledge and almost all sociolinguistic and cultural references. Able to understand nuance and subtlety, and follow unpredictable turns of thought. Text include sophisticated editorials, specialized journal articles, novels, plays, poems, as well as any subject matter area directed to the general reader.

ACTFL PROFICIENCY STANDARDS: WRITING

Intermediate-Low

Able to write short messages, postcards, and simple notes. Can create statements or questions within the scope of limited language experience. Writing produces consists of simple sentences on very familiar topics.

Intermediate-Mid

Able to write for practical needs. Content involves personal preferences, daily routine, everyday events, and other topics grounded in personal experience. Can express present time and at least one other time frame (nonpast, habitual, imperfective). Writing tends to be a loose collection of sentences or sentence fragments on a given topic and provides little evidence of conscious organization.

Intermediate-High

Able to meet most practical writing needs and limited social demands. Can take notes in some detail on familiar topics and respond in writing to personal questions. Can write simple letters, brief synopses and paraphrases, summaries of biographical data, work and school experience. Can express time, tense, or aspect rather consistently, but not always accurately. An ability to describe and narrate in paragraphs is emerging.

Advanced

Able to write routine social correspondence and join sentences in simple discourse of at least several paragraphs in length on familiar topics. Can write simple social correspondence, take notes, write cohesive summaries and resumes, as well as narratives and descriptions of a factual nature. May still make errors in punctuation, spelling, or the formation of nonalphabetic symbols. Makes frequent errors in producing complex sentences. Uses a limited number of cohesive devices accurately. Writing may resemble literal translation from the native language, but a sense of organization is emerging.

Advanced Plus

Able to write about a variety of topics with significant precision and in detail. Can write most social and informal business correspondence. Can describe and narrate personal experiences fully but has difficulty supporting points of view in written discourse. Can write about the concrete aspects of topics relating to particular interests and special fields of competence. Often shows remarkable fluency and ease of expression, but under time constraints and pressure writing may be inaccurate. Generally strong in either grammar or vocabulary, but not in both. Weakness and unevenness in one of the foregoing or in spelling or character writing formation may result in occasional miscommunication. Some misuse of vocabulary may still be evident. Style may still be obviously foreign.

Superior

Able to write clearly in most formal and informal writing. Good control of a full range of structures, spelling or nonalphabetic symbol production, and a wide general vocabulary allow the writer to hypothesize and present arguments or points of view accurately and effectively. An underlying organization, such as chronological ordering, logical ordering, cause and effect, comparison, and thematic development is strongly evident, although not thoroughly executed.

APPENDIX F
Sample Matrix to guide Bilingual Authorization Routes
CSET:LOTE Examination Subtest Domains and Program Coursework
http://www.cset.nesinc.com/CS_SMR_opener.asp

Subtest	Domain	Knowledge, Skills and Abilities	Course(s)
Subtest II or III: Assessment of Language and Communication Skills Domains 5, 6, 7 & 8 (Subtest choice depends on the language)	5. Language and Communication: Listening Comprehension	5.1 Literal Comprehension of Spoken Communication	
		5.2 Inferential and Interpretive Comprehension of Spoken Communication	
		5.3 Critical Analysis of Spoken Communication	
	6. Language and Communication: Reading Comprehension	6.1 Literal Comprehension of Written Texts	
		6.2 Inferential and Interpretive Comprehension of Written Texts	
		6.3 Critical Analysis of Written Texts	
	7. Language and Communication: Oral Expression	7.1 Speaking in the Target Language for a Variety of Purposes in Authentic Contexts	
	8. Language and Communication: Written Expression	8.1 Writing in the Target Language for a Variety of Purposes in Authentic Contexts	
Subtest IV: Bilingual Education and Intercultural Communication; Instruction and Assessment	1: Bilingual Education and Bilingualism	001 Foundations of Bilingual Education	
		002 Bilingualism and Biliteracy	
	2: Intercultural Communication	003 Intercultural Communication and Culturally Inclusive Instruction	
		004 School, Home, and Community Collaboration	
	3: Instruction and Assessment	005 Language and Literacy Instruction and Assessment in Bilingual Education Settings	
		006 Content Instruction and Assessment in Bilingual Education Settings	
		007 Evaluation, Use, and Augmentation of Materials in Bilingual Education Settings	

APPENDIX F *(continued)*

Sample Matrix to guide Bilingual Authorization Routes
CSET:LOTE Examination Subtest Domains and Program Coursework

http://www.cset.nesinc.com/CS_SMR_opener.asp

Subtest	Domain	Knowledge, Skills and Abilities	Course(s)
Subtest V: Geographic and Historical Contexts; Sociopolitical and Sociocultural Contexts	1: Geographic and Historical Contexts	001 The Geographic and Demographic Contexts	
		002 The Historical Context	
	2: Sociopolitical and Sociocultural Contexts	003 The Sociopolitical Context	
		004 The Sociocultural Context	
		005 Crosscultural, Intercultural, and Intracultural Contexts	

Institution Plan for Recommending Candidates for Bilingual Authorization

If a candidate has passed the following CSET: LOTE Subtest, then the courses indicated will be waived

CSET:LOTE Subtest Passed	Course(s) that may be waived
III: Content Domains for Subject Matter Understanding and Skill in Languages Other than English	
IV: Bilingual Education and Bilingualism; Intercultural Communication; Instruction and Assessment	
V: Geographic and Historical Contexts; Sociopolitical and Sociocultural Contexts	

